

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Re-examination and favorable reconsideration in light of the following comments are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 7, 9 - 64, and 122 are pending in the application. Claims 1 - 7, 9 - 64, and 122 stand rejected.

In the office action mailed November 23, 2005, claims 1 - 7, 9 - 17, 21, 22, 35, 36, 42 - 45 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. in view of Zingher et al.; claims 18 - 20, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. in view of Zingher et al. and further in view of Franklin et al.; and claims 25 - 34, 37 - 41, 46 - 60, 62 - 64, and 122 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al. in view of Zingher et al. and further in view of Rodgers et al.

The foregoing rejections have been traversed by the present response.

As noted in Applicant's previous response, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the following limitation: "said PIN number creating step further comprising selecting at least two digits for a security segment to be incorporated into said PIN number wherein an alarm signal is sent when said user enters said PIN number with at least one of said at least two digits used for said security segment".

Additionally, as noted in the previous response, independent claim 42 has been amended to include the following limitation: "said PIN number creating means comprising means for selecting a plurality of digits to act as a first segment of said PIN number and for selecting at least one additional digit to act as a security segment incorporated into said PIN number so that use of said PIN number with said security segment by

said user triggers an alarm activation mechanism in said system".

It is submitted that both of these limitations places claims 1 and 42 in condition for allowance. Neither Hoffman et al. nor Zingher et al. teaches or suggests incorporating, or embedding, a security feature of at least one or two digits into the PIN number itself so that when the PIN number is used with the security segment an alarm is triggered. Zingher et al. teaches the concept of providing a mechanism for triggering an alarm system; however, the Zingher et al. mechanism is using a number other than the PIN number. In other words, Zingher et al. teaches or suggests doing something other than what is being claimed. There is nothing in Zingher et al. which teaches or suggests incorporating or embedding a security feature into the PIN itself.

Claims 2 - 7, 9 - 41, and 43 - 64 are allowable for the same reasons as their respective parent claim(s) as well as on their own accord. The Franklin et al. and the Rodgers et al. references do not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of the Hoffman et al. and Zingher et al. references.

With regard to independent claim 122, it is allowable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 42. Neither Zingher, Rodgers, nor Hoffman et al. teach or suggest the security feature claimed by Applicant.

The instant application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

A Notice of Appeal is appended hereto in the event that the Examiner maintains the rejections of record.

No fee is believed to be due as a result of the instant response since Applicant has previously paid for a Notice of Appeal. Should the Director determine that an additional fee is

due, he is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Should the Examiner believe an additional amendment is needed to place the case in condition for allowance, he is hereby invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Raanan Liebermann

By 

Barry L. Kelmachter
BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Reg. No. 29,999
Attorney for Applicant

Telephone: (203) 777-6628 ext. 112
Telefax: (203) 865-0297
Email: docket@bachlap.com

Date: February 21, 2006

I, Nicole Motzer, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313" on February 21, 2006.

